

Watchman and State Journal.

E. P. WALTON AND SON, PUBLISHERS.

MONTPELIER, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1837.

VOL. XXX, NO. 22...WHOLE NO. 1583.

Watchman & State Journal.

82 PER ANNUM...\$1.50 IN ADVANCE.

From the Knickerbocker for February.

THE WRECK OF THE MEXICO.

'Twas in the morning watch—a cheerless morn—
Keen smote the blast which heralded the day,
When a stout bark, her crew with hardship worn,
Fashed toward her port, with none to point the way:
Clear screamed aloft her lantern's signal ray,
But brought, alas! no pilot's friendly hail;
The frequent gust a shower of frozen spray
Swept from the shrouds, encased in icy mail,
And scarce the shivering tars could raise the stifled sail.

The humble inmates of the crowded berths,
The richer few, who cozier couches prest,
Perchance were dreaming of the cheerful hearth
Where, soon they hoped for welcome and for rest;
Perchance of home, and those who made it blent;
Long had they seen, with weary eye, the sun
Sink day by day into the landless west,
But now the boom they coveted was won,
The shore they sought was near, their travail well nigh done.

The matron murmured softly in her sleep,
Of prosperous days, and clasped her infant boy;
The maiden dreamed of one who o'er the deep
Went to seek for a home, and in her joy
Hung round his neck, too happy to be coy;
The husband deemed his toil with riches crowned,
Which tided power could tide not, nor destroy;
Aerial hoop all eyelids fluttered round,
And beckoned with her wings to Freedom's hallow-ed ground.

From such blest dreams, if such were theirs, they woke.

To all that thought can picture of despair,
High o'er the bark the mateless ocean broke,
And death was in the paralyzing air,
Oh! when the remnant crew designed to dare,
Safe from the bilging wreck were seen to glide,
What were the many of those left behind?
With tossing arms they thronged the vessel's side,
Seeking to heaven for aid, while howling seas replied!

They perished, one by one, that pilgrim crowd—
The silver-haired, the beautiful, the young;
Some were found wrapt as in a crystal shroud
Of waves congealed, that tombled them where they clung.
Some on the strand the sounding breakers flung,
Linked in affection's agonized embrace;
And to the gaze's eyes the warm tears sprung,
As they beheld two babes—a group of grace—
Locked in each other's arms, and pillowed face to face!

They rest in earth—the sea's recovered prey—
No tempests now their dreamless sleep assail;
But when to friends and kindred far away,
Some quivering in shall tell the dismal tale,
From many a home will burst the voice of wail;
But when it ceases, and the tear drop leaves
The cheek no more, shall gratitude prevail—
Yearnings of love towards those beyond the waves.

Who bore with solemn rites, the exiles to their graves,
New York, January, 1837.

IT SNOWS.—BY MRS. HALE.

"It snows!" cries the school-boy—"Hurrah!" and his shout.

Is ringing through parlor and hall,
While swift, as the wing of a swallow, he's out,
And his play-mates have answered his call;
It makes the heart leap to witness their joy—
Proud wealth has no pleasures, I trow,
Like the rapture that throbs in the pulse of the boy.

As he gathers his treasures of snow;
Then lay not the trappings of gold on thine heels,
While health and the riches of nature are thine.
"It snows!" sighs the Imbecile—"Ah!" and his breath.

Comes heavy, as clogged with a weight;
While from the pale aspect of nature in death,
He turns to the blaze of his grate;
And nearer, and nearer, his soft cushioned chair,
Is whirled round in the eddying drift of the air,
He dreads the chill puff of the snow-burdened air.

Least it wither his delicate frame;
Oh! small is the pleasure existence can give,
When the fear we shall die only proves that we live!

"It snows!" cries the Traveller—"Ho!" and the word.

Has quickened the steepl's lagging pace;
The wind rushes by, but his howls are unheard—
Unfath the sharp drift in his face!
For bright through the tempest his own home appeared—
Ah, though leagues intervened, he can see;
There's the clear, glowing hearth, and the table prepared.

And his wife with her babes at her knee,
Blest thought! how it lightens the grief-laden hour,
That those we love dearest are safe from its power.

"It snows!" cries the Belle—"Dear, how lucky!" and thus.

From her mirror to watch the flakes fall;
Like the first rose of summer, her dimpled cheek burns.

While musing on sleigh-ride and ball;
There are visions of conquests, of splendor, and mirth,
Floating over each drear winter's day;
But the tints of hope, on this snow-beaten earth,
Will melt, like the snow-flakes, away;
Turn, then, thou to Heaven, fair maiden, for bliss,
That world has a pure spot not opened in this.

"It snows!" cries the Widow—"Oh! God," and her sighs.

Has stifled the voice of her prayer;
Is hushed in her tear swollen eyes,
On her cheek, with fast falling and care,
"Tis night—and her fatherless ass for bread—
But 'He gives the young ravens their food,'
And she trusts till her dark heart aches with horror to dread.

And she lays on her last clasp of wood,
Poor sufferer, thy sorrow that God only knows!
'Tis a bitter lot to be poor, when it snows!

DRINKING SONG.

By a Member of a Temperance Society, as sung by
Mr. Spring, at Waterman's Hall.

Come pass round the pail, boys, and give it no quarter,
Drink deep, and drink oft, and replenish your jug;
Fill up, and I'll give you a toast to your water—
The Turncock forever, that opens the plug!

Then hey for a bucket, a bucket, a bucket,
Then hey for a bucket filled up to the brim!
Or, best of all notions, let's have a by ocean,
With plenty of room for a sink or a swim!

Let topers of grape juice exultingly vapor,
But let us just whisper a word to the elves;
We water roads, horses, & bays, ribands, bank-paper,
Pinks, pots, and moses, and why not ourselves?

Then hey for a bucket, &c.

The village they cry, think of Spain's & of France's
The jigs, the boleros, fandangoes, and jumps;
But water's the spring of all civilized dances;
We go to a ball not in bottles, but pumps!

Then hey for a bucket, &c.

Let others of Dorchester quaff their pleasure,
Or honor old Menx with their thirsty regard;
We'll drink of Adam's ale, and we get it pool measure,
Or quaff heavy wet from the bottom in the yard!

Then hey for a bucket, &c.

Some flatter gin, brandy, and rum, on their merits,
Grog, punch, and what not, that enliven a feast;

'Tis true that they stir up the animal spirits,
But may not the animal turn out a beast?
Then hey for a bucket, &c.

The man of the ark, who continued our species,
He saved us by water—but as for the wine,
We all saw the figure, more sad than facetious,
He made after tasting the juice of the vine.

Then hey for a bucket, &c.

In wine let a lover rene when his jewel,
And pledge her in bumper fill'd brimming and oft;
But we can distinguish the kind from the cruel,
And toast them in water, the hard and the soft.

Then hey for a bucket, &c.

Some cross'd in their passion can never overlook it,
But take to a pistol, a knife, or a beam;
Whilst temperate swains are enabled to brook it
By the help of a little meandering stream.

Then hey for a bucket, &c.

Should fortune diminish our cash's sum total,
Deranging our wits and our private affairs,
Though some in such cases would fly to the bottle,
There's nothing like water for drowning our cares.

Then hey for a bucket, &c.

See drinkers of water, their wits never lacking,
Direct as a rail road, and smooth in their gait;
But look at the bibbers of wine, they go tacking,
Like ships that have met a foul wind in the strait.

Then hey for a bucket, &c.

A fig then for Burgundy, Claret, or Mountain,
A few scanty glasses must limit your wish,
But he's the true top that goes to the fountain,
The drinker that verily "drinks like a fish!"

Then hey for a bucket, &c.

For the Watchman & State Journal.

ABOLITIONISM.

I again write in haste, and of course my opinions on a subject of so vast importance as abolitionism or slavery cannot be entitled to so much weight as they would, were they the result of more deliberate and careful enquiry.

But I have often thought, and have read much even in childhood, on slavery. The subject is not, therefore, entirely new to me.

Without intending, at this time, to engage much in discussion, I am merely to state my views on all, or nearly all, the controverted points in the discussion, in as brief a manner as possible, thereby giving to any one an opportunity of convincing me of error, wherever I may happen to be wrong. But this must be done in a friendly manner, and in a far different spirit than seems to actuate a majority of the abolitionist periodicals of the day, and some of their opponents.

I will first state wherein I agree with the abolitionists. 1. I believe with them that slavery is an evil; that the voluntarily holding man in servitude, as slaves, is a sin against God. It does not seem necessary to multiply words on this point, in order to be correctly understood. Suffer me to remark, however, that the above is unquestionably the generally received opinion among all classes of men in the freest states.

2. I believe, with the abolitionists, that slavery should be abolished, as soon as it can be done, without inflicting a greater evil on the master and slave than the continuance of slavery itself. I suppose that no intelligent and candid abolitionist will quarrel with the above sentiment. It only remains to be shown when the period for the abolition of slavery has arrived. This is a point not now to be discussed.

3. I believe with the abolitionists, or at least with a majority, if not all, of the most candid and intelligent, that the free states have no civil power which they can exert for the abolition of slavery; that each state must regulate this subject for itself; nor has any power been vested in Congress or the federal government over the subject of slavery, so as to enable them to accomplish its abolition. Consequently, if ever slavery is abolished, it must be done by the slaveholding states themselves. The power of the non-slaveholding states can be only advisory.

4. I believe with the abolitionists that Congress alone possesses power to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia. They certainly can exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatever over the District, and the states of Virginia and Maryland by their cession to the General Government have lost all legislative authority and control over the same. It would be preposterous in the extreme to maintain that slavery cannot be abolished at all in that District, and if Congress does not possess the power, it cannot be said to exist.

I will next state wherein I cannot agree with the abolitionists, or at least with some of their leading writers and lecturers.

1. I cannot believe that all slave holding is sin. O'Connell and Garrison may slander the character of Washington, and other great and good men, as much or as little as they choose; I have no doubt, but they acted as good men should act in their circumstances. All voluntary slave holding I believe to be sinful, and incapable of justification. But we must view the case as it actually is. The present generation were not the authors of the present system of slavery. The crime of its introduction belongs not to them; the crime of its voluntary continuance may indeed be theirs, and I am willing to admit, it is a fearful thing. He who holds a slave for gain, merely, is doing a fearful wrong, but he who holds a slave because the laws of his state will not permit him to emancipate him, or because his slave is not mentally nor morally qualified for freedom, and does all in his power to promote the comfort of his slave and to elevate his character, is only doing what duty requires him to do. Slavery can only be justified by necessity. Can any man of sane mind, deny that this necessity does not sometimes exist?

2. I object in toto to the doctrine of "total & immediate emancipation." Slavery is the entire subjection of one person to the will of another. The slave may cease to be regarded as property that may be bought & sold; the law may even protect him in his social rights as a husband, a parent or a child, yet if his master may command his services even as an apprentice, and retain him from running at large, I know not what other name to call him than a slave. Certainly he is not a freeman. But who seriously doubts, except it be a very few crazy fanatics—that if the slaves were immediately and universally let loose from all restraint, and raised in law to the dignity of freemen—legislated as they are represented to be by both the abolitionists, and the defenders of slavery at the South—the consequences must be disastrous in the extreme? What then is the remedy for this great and alarming evil? It is no less than the making both the master and the slave, Christians in deed and in truth. It is making them both willing and able to be free. A mighty revolution is needed at the South, and the efforts of our abolitionists are only throwing obstacles in the way of its progress.

I am aware that the doctrine against which I am contending has recently been explained away. Total has been explained to mean partial, and immediate to mean gradual, but the motto of the Anti-Slavery Society still remains like a stumbling block in the way. A good cause cannot need a motto which must be contradicted in order to be sustained.

3. I object to the claim of power by Congress to abolish the domestic slave trade.—Congress, by the constitution, has power to regulate—and regulate does not mean abolish, any more than regulate means to expunge—commerce among the several states. Slaves, by the several states in which slavery is permitted, are regarded by them as property, and Congress can show no grant of power in the constitution to abolish or destroy this right of property. The object of this section of the constitution has no connection with slavery in any manner.

4. I object to joining in any crusade against the American Colonization Society. May not a colony of free blacks be established in Africa, and even slavery be abolished in the United States at the same time? Why may not the abolitionists let the colonizationists entirely alone? The objects of both their societies are in no manner inconsistent with each other. But the argument is, that Southern slaveholders are the advocates of colonization. And has it come to this, that a slaveholder may not be permitted to do right, or that whatever he does must consequently be wrong?

5. I object to the formation of Anti-Slavery Societies in the Northern States as ridiculous and unnecessary. For what purpose are they needed? The grand system of associated moral effort is both beautiful and sublime; but the formation of unnecessary and foolish societies has only a tendency to destroy the influence of those that are needed. "But what! Temperance Societies were necessary to correct public opinion on the subject of temperance, and these Societies are necessary to correct public opinion at the North on the subject of slavery." But Intemperance was an evil existing in our midst, and Temperance Societies were, and still are, necessary to remove it—but slavery exists not among us, and public opinion at the North is already as much opposed to slavery as abolitionists can make it. An Anti-Slavery Society in Virginia might possibly do some good, but here, in Vermont, it falls far below being respectable nonsense.

AMICUS POPULI.

For the Watchman and State Journal.

WHAT'S IN A NAME? WHY MUCH TO BE SURE!

Who will not exclaim against filling a sheet of paper we mean—upon so trifling a matter as that of bestowing christian names upon little babies? Verily we say it is no trifling matter. To begin we will speak of the practice which is quite common hereabouts, and for ought we know to the contrary, in other parts; to wit, the giving children double names, or two distinct christian names, and then invariably calling them by the second instead of the first of said names, a practice which we aver to be utterly indefensible and highly improper, inasmuch as it is equivalent to introducing people to the world under the disguise of a wrong name. It is no unusual occurrence after social intercourse with a person for years, to discover all at once that his real name is different from the name by which you have always known him; and it sometimes happens that the first knowledge a merchant or lawyer has of the proper and lawful name of a person they have known for a considerable time, is before a Justice of the Peace, when one finds he has got a wrong name in his book, the other in his writ. Why cannot Parents, whether they bestow upon their little paragon two names or twenty, let that one come first in order which they prefer speaking at length? We would pronounce the custom here alluded to as not merely improper, but absolutely absurd, did we allow ourselves the use of such expressions; but as we do not, we shall not thus characterize it.

The custom of bestowing a string of names upon a child when one would abundantly answer every purpose for which christian names are designed, or calling them by the names of distinguished personages, we feel no disposition to quarrel with, as the exceeding weakness it denotes in the fond Parent, has a stronger claim upon our commiseration, than the custom is deserving our reprehension. Yet we cannot conscientiously pass it by, without deprecating on behalf of the poor children, a practice which will frequently in after life expose them to comparisons, which, whatever the doating parents may dream to the contrary, will seldom be to their advantage. Would it not be more kind and considerate to designate a child by some name, which, while it would not expose him to unfavorable comparisons in case he should, by some mischance, disappoint the confident expectations of his fond parents, would, in the event of his rising to eminence, insure to him the enviable honor of adding another to the already existing list of distinguished names?

Giving children the same christian name as their fathers or those near of kindred whose surname is the same, is also an objectionable practice. It is in a measure a defeat the object of instituting christian names, which was for the purpose of distinguishing between those of the same surname. When two or more have both the same christian and surname, it subjects all who ever have occasion to speak of either, to the necessity of resorting to such mode of designation as suggest itself at the moment, as which John Smith do you mean? I mean the old man, or the young man, or the father, or the son; but more frequently some mode of distinction, originating in accident or waggery, adheres to the name through life; as long John, limping John, red-haired John, etc. And if some of these additions happen to be displeasing or provoking, the individuals to whom they are applied, have generally to thank their affectionate Parents, for occasioning the necessity of an affix or cognomen of some sort, to distinguish them from others of the same name. Again we cannot refrain from remonstrating on behalf of the poor children against the practice of bestowing upon them christian names, which, either upon their christian names, or upon their surnames, are liable to call up some ludicrous idea, or are readily susceptible of some ridiculous paraphrase, which both mortify and irritate, and encourage a disposition to harbor secret ill will towards their associates, or to bet certain pugnacious propensities, which it is sometimes difficult to leave behind when they exchange their school companions for the society of men.

Giving children long break-jaw names, or names difficult of articulation, is almost invariably the occasion of their receiving nicknames, or what is equivalent thereto, a contraction or curtailment of their proper names; so that the fancy or caprice of their parents in giving them names which a little reflection would have told them that nobody would ever take the pains to pronounce, is not only disappointing, but must bear the responsibility of tempting or driving the world to distinguish their offspring by offensive or at least undesirable nicknames; all of which might have been prevented by bestowing on their children in the first instance, modest, moderate, and easily spoken names.

It is not unfrequently the case that children are indebted directly to the parents themselves for their nicknames, or the contraction of their proper names, such as Jack, Tom, Sam, Bill, Bob, Frank, etc. It probably never occurred to these wise and considerate parents, that when they are heard to call their own children by such names, all feel at liberty to do the same; and furthermore it probably never occurred to these long sighted parents, that in indulging themselves in calling their children by names which pass tolerably well during infancy and boyhood, they are indelibly stamping juvenile and familiar appellations upon their manhood. Were parents careful to address their children on all occasions by their proper names, and to require all those under their authority to do the same, their connections and acquaintances would very generally follow the example, and the little attempts to restore proper names when years of puberty are attained would become unnecessary. The importance of adhering to proper names in addressing either children or grown persons is duly estimated but by few. The habit of calling children by nicknames actually invites rude familiarity to intermingle with them, which they, very naturally, soon learn to retaliate, whereas the practice of calling them by their proper names has as certainly a tendency to check coarse familiarity. There is something of respect and consideration in addressing a child by its proper name, which unconsciously strikes every one as being out of joint with coarse and improper familiarity. These remarks will apply with greater force to cases where the parties have arrived at adult age—Who has not observed in cases of either good humored or passionate rudeness, that a nickname, or a contraction of the proper name of the person attacked, is almost invariably substituted in place of the proper name itself, even where the assailants are in the general practice of addressing the party by his proper name. Ask a lad or young man why he does not address his associates by their proper names, "O, he will say, 'it is to stiff and formal to say William, and Benjamin, and Isaac, etc.' Now it is true this manner of addressing playmates and associates is felt in a small degree to be formal and respectful, and this is precisely the reason which more, perhaps, than any other, enhances the importance of the practice here advocated. All above the age of early boyhood, must have observed and felt the universal tendency of the intercourse amongst familiar acquaintance, degenerating into rude, disrespectful, and consequently disagreeable familiarity, which is the very bane of social enjoyment amongst those, more especially in early life, who live on terms of what is called intimacy; and any check upon this tendency, which does not necessarily operate as a restraint upon a free, easy, and agreeable intercourse, amongst intimate associates, must be admitted to possess high intrinsic value.

Now at your doors, Fathers and Mothers, or Pa's and Ma's, or Dads and Mams, or by whatever other appellation you teach your little ones to distinguish you, lies the root of the evils we have been bringing before your eyes. It being contrary to our nature, and at variance with our established practice, to use harsh words or say hard things on any occasion, much less when there is no occasion at all, we shall therefore express exactly the tythe of what we feel in relation to the matter in hand, by observing in conclusion, that the very frequent recurrence of bestowing upon children a plurality of christian names and then distinguishing them by the last instead of the first; of giving them duplicative names, or names of which there already exist exact prototypes; of naming them after celebrated personages; of giving them hard and testy names, which few can with safety venture to pronounce at length; of giving them ludicrous names, such as will inevitably bring upon them the jokes and gibes of their school mates; and, lastly of contracting their proper names, or calling them by nicknames, is an evidence of such thoughtlessness, inconsiderateness, weakness, vanity, capricious fancy, stupidity, etc. etc. on the part of parents, as to give rise to serious doubts whether many have not assumed the paternal office some dozen or score of years too early.

SATIRICUS REFORM & CO.

Rice Pudding. If you want a common rice pudding to retain its flavor, do not cook it or put it into boiling water when it is cold. Wash it in a bag, leave plenty of room for it to swell, throw it away when the water boils and let it boil about an hour and a half.

The Baltimore Chronicle says that among the members of the abolition convention recently held at Harrisburgh, were a good many colored persons.

The population of the state of Missouri has nearly doubled itself in ten years.

In Paris bread is two cents a pound, London three, in America, the greatest grain growing country in the world, six. Why is this?

We guess more bread is eaten in America than in Europe, compared with the population; and we also guess that America manufactures more grain into ardent spirits.

The path of truth, is a plain and a safe path; that of falsehood, is a perplexing maze.

Falling Stars.—Prof. Arago, of Paris, suggests the idea, that the falling stars, which have been witnessed for three or four years past, about the 13th of November, belong to a zone composed of millions of small bodies whose orbits strike the plane of ecliptic, towards the point which the earth occupies between the 11th and 13th of November; and that this zone is a new planetary world just beginning to be revealed to us. This, certainly, is a very splendid conception.

THE PRESIDENT'S LETTER TO THE INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 26, 1837.

SIR—I received on the eve of the 24th instant, your letter covering a copy of certain resolutions, purporting to have been adopted by a committee of the House of Representatives, of which you are chairman, and request that you will lay before that committee this my reply, which I hasten to make:

It appears by the published proceedings of the House of Representatives, that the committee of which you are chairman, was appointed on your motion. The resolution offered by you, and finally adopted by the House, raised a direct issue with that part of my annual message, in which I held the following language: "Before concluding this paper, I think it due to the various executive departments to bear testimony to the prosperous condition, and to the ability and integrity with which they have been conducted. It has been my aim to enforce in all of them a vigilant and faithful discharge of the public business, and it is gratifying to me to believe, that there is no just cause of complaint, from any quarter, at the manner in which they have fulfilled the object of their creation."

Your resolution is in the following words:—"Resolved, That so much of the President's Message as relates to the condition of the various executive departments, the ability and integrity with which they have been conducted, the vigilant and faithful discharge of the public business in all of them, and the causes of complaint from any quarter, at the manner in which they have fulfilled the objects of their creation, be referred to a select committee, to consist of nine members, with power to send for persons and papers, and with instructions to inquire into the condition of the various executive departments, the ability and integrity with which they have been conducted—into the manner in which the public business has been discharged in all of them, and into all causes of complaint from any quarter, at the manner in which said departments or their bureaux, or offices, or any of their officers or agents of every description whatever, directly or indirectly connected with them in any manner, officially or unofficially, in duties pertaining to the public interest, have fulfilled or failed to accomplish the objects of their creation, or have violated their duties, or have injured and impaired the public service and interest; and that said committee in its inquiries may refer to such periods of time as to them may seem expedient and proper."

It also appears from the published proceedings of the House, that this resolution was accompanied and supported by a speech of considerable length, in which you preferred many severe but vague charges of corruption and abuse in the Executive Departments. The resolutions adopted by the committee, as well as that adopted by the House itself, must be taken in connexion with your introductory speech, which gives a character to the whole proceeding. When thus regarded, it is obvious that, by the resolution of the House, an issue is made with the President of the U. S., as he had alleged in his annual message, that the heads of the Executive Departments had performed their official duties with ability and integrity. In your speech you denied this; you charged them with manifold corruptions and abuses of trust, as you had done in former speeches to which you referred—and you demanded an investigation through the medium of a committee. Certain other members of the House, as appears by the published debates, united with you in these accusations, and for the purpose of ascertaining their truth or falsehood, the committee you demanded was ordered to be raised, and you were placed at its head. The first proceeding of the investigating committee is to pass a series of resolutions, which, though amended in their passage, were, as understood, introduced by you; calling on the President and the heads of departments, not to answer to any specific charge—not to give information as to any particular transaction, but assuming that they have been guilty of the charges alleged, calls upon them to furnish evidence against themselves.

After the reiterated charges you have made, it was to have been expected that you would have been prepared to reduce them to specifications, and that the committee would then proceed to investigate the matters alleged. But instead of this, you resort to generalities even more vague than your original accusations, and in open violation of the constitution and of that well established and wise maxim, "that all men are presumed to be innocent until proven guilty according to the established rules of law." You request myself and the heads of the departments to become our own accusers. And this call purports to be founded on the authority of that body in which alone, by the constitution, the power of impeaching us is vested! The heads of departments may answer such a request as they please, provided they do not withdraw their own time and that of the officers under their direction from the public business to the injury thereof. To that business I shall direct them to devote themselves, in preference to any illegal and unconstitutional call for information, no matter from what source it may come, or however anxious they may be to meet it. For myself, I shall repel all such attempts as an invasion of the principles of justice as well as the constitution; and I shall esteem it my sacred duty to the people of the U. S. to resist them as I would the establishment of a Spanish Inquisition.

If, after all the severe accusations contained in the various speeches of yourself and your associates, you are unwilling of your own accord, to bring specific charges, then I request your committee to call yourself and associates, and every other member of Congress who has made the general charge of corruption, to testify before God and our country, whether you or they know of any specific corruption or abuse of trust in the executive departments, and if so, what it is. If you are able to point to any case where there is the slightest reason to suspect corruption or abuse of trust, no obstacle, which I can remove, shall be interposed to prevent the fullest scrutiny by all legal means. The offices of all the departments will be opened to you, and every proper facility furnished for this purpose.

I hope, sir, we shall at last have your charges and that you will proceed to investigate them, not like an inquisitor, but in the accustomed mode. If you either will not make specific accusations, or if when made, you attempt to establish them by making freemen their own accusers, you will not expect me to countenance your proceedings. In the short period which remains of my official duty, I shall endeavor, as I have heretofore endeavored, to fulfill the obligations of that oath of office, by which I engaged, "to the best of my ability, to preserve, protect, and defend the constitution of the U. S.;" and for this, and other reasons of the most solemn character, I shall, on the one hand, cause every possible facility consistent to law and justice, to be given to the investigation of specific tangible charges, and, on the other, shall repudiate all attempts to invade the just rights of the executive departments, and of the individuals composing the same. If, after all your clamor, you still make no specific charges, or bring no proof of such as shall be made, you and your associates must be regarded by the good people of the U. S. as the authors of unfounded calumnies, and the public servants whom you have assailed, will, in the estimation of all honorable men, stand fully acquitted.

In the mean time, I cannot but express my astonishment that members of Congress should call for information as to the names of persons to whom contingent moneys are paid, and the objects of those payments, when there are six standing committees, under the seventy-seventh rule of the House of Representatives, whose special duties are to examine annually into all the details of these expenditures, in each of the executive departments. The like remark is applicable to some other branches of the information sought by you; ample details in respect to which are found in reports laid before Congress, and now on your files, and to which I recommend you to have recourse.

Very respectfully yours,
ANDREW JACKSON.

The Hon. HENRY A. WISE, Chairman of the Investigating Committee in the abuses and frauds of the Executive Departments charged.

Rights of Colored Men in New York.—The House of Assembly of this State on Saturday last, by a vote of 74 to 23 denied the petition of 25 colored men in Troy for such an extension of the Right of suffrage as would enable them to vote. At present only those colored men are permitted to vote who own real property to the amount of \$250, and have resided three years within the State. The Albany Evening Journal alluding to the debate on the petition says:

"It was contended by those who sustained the motion to reject, that the petition revived the excitement; that its object was agitation and turmoil; and that its consequence would be anarchy and disunion."

On the other, it was urged that this petition had no relation to, or connection with the question of Slavery or Abolition; that it came from free, though colored citizens; that it was a question of local policy with which other States had no right to interfere, than this State has to interfere with the domestic policy of those other States; and that this petition should be received and treated in the same manner that other petitions were received and treated."

We trust that the friends of the colored man and of equal rights will use all suitable measures for the accomplishment of the object of the petitioners. The question of the rights of our own colored citizens is entirely distinct from that of the abolition of slavery at the South, and it is to be lamented that the two subjects should be so connected as to injure those for whom, as all admit, we have a right to legislate. We believe that thousands of our most discreet citizens who disapprove the measures of the abolitionists, are still in favor of extending to the colored residents of our own State all the rights and privileges of free white men.

In our view they are far better entitled to the right of suffrage than a large class of those who now enjoy it. In Massachusetts ever since the adoption of her constitution, colored men have been entitled not only to vote, but to hold office and enjoy every other privilege of white men, and we have heard that an experience of fifty years has shown that that ancient and well-regulated commonwealth has ever sustained from this cause any detriment.—N. York Observer.

Two men having gone to sleep on a lime-kiln, near Philadelphia, were found dead the next morning.

A Hint.—A little salt sprinkled over the ice on stone steps or brick sidewalks, will soon loosen it, so that it may be easily detached without the necessity of chopping it with axes or shovels. Thus much labor and consequent expense may be saved—and the steps and sidewalks will not be injured by removing the ice.—Bost. Mer. J.

The licensing board of the city of Bangor, (Me.) have come to the determination not to grant any more licenses for the sale of ardent spirits.

Robinson, who was tried at New York, for the murder of Helen Jewett, has been appointed a lieutenant in the Texan army.

A French writer says that "the modest deportment of those who are truly wise, when contrasted with the assuming air of the ignorant, may be compared to the different appearances of wheat, which, while its ear is empty, holds up its head proudly, but as soon as it is filled with grain, bends modestly down, and withdraws from observation."

In the United States the rate of increase is such as to double the population in 22 years. In Russia, the period of doubling is 42; in England, 52; in Sweden, 100; and in France, 125 years.

DISTANCE OF THE EARTH.—It is calculated that the earth is 2,754,000 miles nearer to the sun in the shortest day, than in the longest.

False Report.—Many of the distant papers are circulating a statement that the U. S. States Arsenal at Watertown in this State, has been destroyed by fire, with 70,000 stand of arms, at a loss of a millions of dollars.—The report is entirely unfounded.—Boston Weekly Messenger.

The Hubbardston Meeting House which was lately burnt, and supposed to be the work of an incendiary, took fire from ashes placed under the stove in a wooden box.

riedly the occasion of their receiving nicknames, or what is equivalent thereto, a contraction or curtailment of their proper names; so that the fancy or caprice of their parents in giving them names which a little reflection would have told them that nobody would ever take the pains to pronounce, is not only disappointing, but must bear the responsibility of tempting or driving the world to distinguish their offspring by offensive or at least undesirable nicknames; all of which might have